

TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL**10 MARCH 2003**

Chair: * Councillor Miles

Councillors: * Mrs Bath (1) * Kara
* Bluston (2) * Mrs Kinnear
* Burchell * John Nickolay
* Choudhury * Anne Whitehead

* Denotes Member present
(1) and (2) Denotes Category of Reserve Member

[Councillors Knowles, Vina Mithani, Janet Mote and Silver also attended and participated in this meeting]

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 – Queensbury Station Area Parking Review – Results of Consultation**

Your Panel received the report of the Head of Environment and Transportation which detailed the results of consultation with local residents on parking options around Queensbury Station.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a deputation from the Chairman of the Queensbury Residents' and Traders' Association (Harrow Branch) (QARA). The depute supported the installation of Minimum Scheme – Option 1 with certain revisions.

The Depute thanked the Council for the second consultation carried out in the Queensbury Station area and stated that the consultation had been far better than the original consultation. He highlighted that the original consultation had received a 25% response compared to a 39% response to the second consultation with a majority in favour of the installation of Minimum Scheme – Option 1. He supported Officers recommendation to implement the scheme but proposed certain revisions.

He requested that the proposed double yellow lines on the north side of Mollison Way east of Turner Road be foreshortened and replaced by retention of the existing single yellow line with a one hour waiting restriction between 11am and 12pm. This would remove commuter parking while still allowing residents' parking in the evening. The second revision was to shorten the length of double yellow lines on Turner Road near the corner of Reynolds Drive to allow residents' to park there.

The Depute stated that his organisation wanted parking on both sides of Reynolds Drive and requested that his organisation approve the letter to be sent to residents regarding the option of double yellow lines across drive ways. He also requested a slight adjustment to the proposed length and positioning of the bus pull-in points in Mollison Way.

In response to a question from a Member, the Depute explained that he proposed that the double yellow lines be installed on the roundabout at the junction of Mollison Way and Turner Road, but the single yellow line be retained outside properties on Mollison Way. Members raised concerns that any parking in this area could cause danger on this stretch of road as there was a bend and cars often travelled at high speeds.

The Transportation Manager informed the meeting that the original plans proposed double yellow lines the length of Mollison Way to make the road safer and allow bus flow. The revised plans included double yellow line 'pull-in points' to assist the flow of traffic and buses. Some of these had been extended to cover driveways and could be shortened in response to objections to the advertised proposals. In response to Members' comments that bus flow could still be affected by parking, Officers explained that this was the minimum scheme and that the other proposed schemes would have improved bus flow further.

In discussion of the proposals for Reynolds Drive, Officers explained that all residents would be written to and offered the choice of either a double yellow line or footway parking across their driveway.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That (1) officers be instructed to take all the necessary steps under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the preferred option (the Minimum Scheme - Option 1, double yellow lines at junctions and problem spots and "at any time" bus stop clearways in Turner Road and Mollison Way, revised to delete sections of proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Mollison Way and Waltham Drive but including the double yellow lines in Mollison Way to create a passing point for buses and large vehicles as shown at Appendix D);

(2) officers be instructed to make an exemption to Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974; as amended by the Road Traffic Act 1991 to allow footway parking across driveways in Reynolds Drive as shown at Appendix D subject to (c); and

(3) Officers be instructed to write to every resident with a driveway in Reynolds Drive offering them the option of a parking bay or double yellow lines across their driveway.

REASON : To deter obstructive parking and improve access and road safety in the area

RECOMMENDATION 2 – Transportation Borough Spending Plan 2004/05 – 2008/09

Your Panel received the report of the Director of Environmental Services which outlined the proposed Transportation Borough Spending Plan (BSP) for 2004/05 to 2008/09 that would form the basis of Harrow's submission to Transport for London (TfL). The Panel noted that schemes in the Spending Plan would be subject to normal consultation procedures at the design and/or order making stages. The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association's adviser commented that each scheme would need to be looked at on its own merits at a future date. A Member suggested that the importance of smoothly running Underground system to Harrow commuters should be stressed to TfL. The Transportation Manager emphasised that the draft Plan was subject to change in the light of on-going liaison with TfL and any changes would be highlighted in the version reported to Cabinet for agreement.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To Cabinet)

That Cabinet agree the programme of schemes shown in Appendices 2 and 3.

REASON: To enable the submission of the Borough Spending Plan – a funding-bid document - to reflect not just the Mayor of London's priorities but also those of the Council and to submit it to Transport for London by the deadline of 30 June 2003.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – Controlled Parking Zones/Residents Parking Schemes – Annual Review and Related Petitions

Your Panel received the report of the Head of Environment and Transportation which detailed the annual review of Controlled Parking Zones/Resident Parking Schemes for the whole borough, including assessments of existing zones and requests for new schemes received in the last twelve months. The petitions referred to the Panel by Council and the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel were also considered in conjunction with this item.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a deputation from the Chairman of Queensbury Residents' and Traders Association. Referring to the petition the Panel had received from residents of Honeypt Lane requesting a CPZ, he suggested that any consultation carried out should be based on the consultation carried out in Queensbury. Discussing the extension to the Harrow Town Centre CPZ, the depute noted that Brent had delayed the implementation of their Northwick Park CPZ and that the price of the scheme for Harrow residents had risen from £30 a year to £40. He suggested all residents should be reconulted on the scheme.

Officers informed the Panel that this report had been brought forward to consider the work priority programme. The report contained last year's programme and the programme for the next six years plus a list of unprogrammed schemes. An Officer reminded the Panel that parking schemes were demand-led and all schemes were subject to consultation.

Referring to the petition received from the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel, he assured the meting that consultation had been carried out correctly. A stakeholder meeting to which Members of the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel had been invited, had taken place and all frontagers were consulted, including the head petitioners' business, with the scheme being based on these results.

Commenting on the two petitions referred to the Panel by Council on improving parking facilities in North Harrow, Officers informed the Panel that the previous consultation on a CPZ in North and West Harrow had produced a negative result overall. The installation of lay-bys in Station Road had been investigated but the projected cost of at least £190,000 had proved prohibitive. An Officer added that consultation with residents' regarding a CPZ in Vaughan Road had proved inconclusive. In response to a question from a Member, the Panel were informed that not all of the forecourts in Station Road were public highway.

Ward Members for Headstone North, present to speak on this item, commented that shops in North Harrow were suffering due to parking problems in the area. Shops were having difficulties receiving deliveries and delivery vehicles were receiving parking tickets and shoppers were unable to park outside the shops. They suggested that the provision of parking bays were a way to keep the area vibrant and to halt the slow attrition of local shops. They understood the difficulty for shoppers and suggested that better parking facilities were needed to prevent further shops closing.

An Officer commented that he was unaware that there had been problems with deliveries and undertook to review the current loading/unloading restrictions. A Member commented that the introduction of parking bays outside shops would possibly make deliveries more problematic and that there was already a large car park nearby. The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association's adviser suggested that the existing bus lay-bys could be used for pay and display bays and the bus stops could be moved further along the road. Members endorsed that that Officers should investigate this proposal.

A Member highlighted the points made earlier by the depute on the extension to the Harrow Town Centre CPZ and suggested that the scheme be suspended for a brief reconsultation. In response Officers informed the Panel that the scheme was never dependent on the implementation of the Brent scheme, as the scheme aimed to provide on street parking for residents', especially those residents' who were forced to park away from their homes because of the existing one hour daytime parking restriction. Following legal advice, it was noted that the scheme could not be suspended as new traffic orders would be required, therefore reconsultation could only take place once the agreed scheme had been implemented.

In response to a Member's query, an Officer informed the Panel that the echelon parking in Rayners Lane had been reviewed as part of the last review at a key stakeholders meeting and it was assessed that no change was necessary.

Following comments from a Member that the two West Harrow schemes appeared very low down on the list of priorities, Officers commented that the two schemes could be combined into one 'in principle ' consultation. However, as these were proposed for the latter years of the programme there would be opportunities each year at the annual review to recommend priorities in the light of changing circumstances.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That (1) the priority list the controlled parking zone programme be as shown at Appendix D and to included in the Borough Spending Plan submission to Transport for London for 2004/05 to 2008/09, and,

(2) the Head Petitioners be advised accordingly.

[REASON: To enable progress on scheme development generally and to allow its inclusion in the Borough Spending Plan]

RECOMMENDATION 4 - Kenton Road - Banned Right Turn into Kenton Lane

Your Panel received a report of the Head of Environment and Transportation which explained that Brent Council had introduced an experimental scheme that had banned the right turn from Kenton Road into Kenton Lane.

The Chair explained that the experimental scheme introduced by Brent was designed as a safety scheme. He noted that the Conservative Group had tabled an amendment proposing that the scheme be objected to and calling for the installation of an extra lane for right turns. In response, an Officer informed the meeting that he did not believe there was enough space on the road to accommodate an extra lane. Requests had been received from local residents for traffic calming measures, and the overriding objective was to reduce the number of cars in the area. Brent would receive objections to the scheme for six months and the scheme could be in place for up to 18 months. Ward Councillors for Kenton East and West had been consulted but so far only one had responded.

The scheme was a safety scheme as seven injury accidents had occurred during the study period. A problem that had occurred with the scheme was that few motorists were using the suggested alternative route.

The Ward Member for Kenton West, present to speak on this item, commented that residents were opposed to all four proposals and that lorries were having difficulties negotiating the sharp left turn on the alternative route. Another Member suggested that a right filter light be installed instead. Officers advised that a right filter would add an extra phase to the traffic lights, reducing their efficiency, increasing delays and defeating the aim of improving conditions.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association's adviser commented that he supported the scheme as it reduced congestion at the junction and that he was surprised that the right turn from Kenton Lane to Kenton Road had not also been banned.

An Officer informed the Panel that the Police would be asked to monitor motorists making the banned right turn at the junction. However, the scheme had improved east-west traffic flow. A Member voiced his sympathy for local residents, and suggested that measures to improve the traffic lights should be considered.

Members suggested that, in their experience that the junction had run smoothly prior to the introduction of the ban, especially since the re-phasing of the traffic lights. They had witnessed several cars making the banned right turn and that traffic had struggled to make the left turn on the alternative route. The road used for the alternative route was not suitable for large volumes of traffic. They suggested that Brent should be asked to remove the scheme because of the negative effects it had on Harrow residents. A Member referred to the tabled amendment, requesting that the scheme be objected to and that other solutions be investigated, and commented that the scheme had not succeeded in improving traffic flow. The scheme had also exported the rat-running problem from Brent to Harrow.

A Ward Member for Kenton West disputed claims that traffic congestion had not improved at the junction. He commented that he supported the scheme although he was not totally satisfied with the scheme.

(Councillor Mrs Bath, Kara, Mrs Kinnear and John Nickolay wished to be recorded as voting against the recommendation)

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That (1) no objections to be made to Brent's experimental scheme;

(2) the local community be consulted on a traffic calming scheme to reduce the adverse impact of the banned turn on Harrow's side;

(3) Funding be sought from Transport for London (TfL) for a traffic calming scheme;

(4) Officers be instructed to introduce the proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions (no waiting at any time) under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended in accordance with the details at Appendix G subject to consideration of objections to the traffic order. The statement of reasons to be "to improve road safety" and to "control parking".

REASON: To improve safety and residential amenity.

RECOMMENDATION 5 – The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002

Your Panel received a report of the Head of Environment and Transportation which detailed new regulations governing traffic signs and their implications.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That (1) formal objections to the laying of zigzag markings at existing toucan crossings be considered by the Portfolio Holder;

(2) the proposed consultation requirements for bus stop clearways as shown at Appendix A be adopted; and

(3) all bus stops with bus stop "cages" be made Bus Stop Clearways subject to funding and the consultation procedure be as set out in (2) above.

[REASON: To comply with new regulations governing traffic signs]

RECOMMENDATION 6 – Walton Road/Harley Road – Petition for Yellow Lines

Your Panel received a report of the Head of Environment and Transportation which explained the proposed response to a petition requesting yellow lines at the junction of Walton Road and Harley Road.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That Ghost Capes be laid at the junction of Walton Road/Harley Road as shown at Appendix E and the Head Petitioner be advised accordingly.

[REASON: To improve safety and access by emergency vehicles]

RECOMMENDATION 7 - Lowlands Road Local Safety Scheme and Harrow on the Hill Station Interchange Proposals – Consultation Results

Your Panel received a report of the Head of Environment and Transportation which detailed the proposed Lowlands Road Local Safety Scheme and Harrow on the Hill Station Interchange and reported on the favourable consultation results.

The Chair reminded the Panel that this scheme was designed to reduce speed and accidents, and improve cycling facilities. The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association's adviser voiced his support for the scheme, except for the entry treatment to Grove Hill Road. He explained that it was an emergency route for buses and that the existing shape of the kerb meant that had to slow down for the corner.

A Member, present to speak on this item commented that there had been problems with the consultation. He informed the Panel that consultation responses were due in on 23 December 2002 and that Lansdowne Road had five properties, not one as indicated in the table of consultation responses. The scheme would also lead to the removal of seven parking bays, resulting in the loss of Council revenue. He commented that the abuse of the blue badge system caused parking problems in the area. He added that speed tables would not improve road safety as the traffic already travelled slowly at the junctions. A Ward Member for Greenhill commented on his support for the scheme, although he supported the removal of the entry treatment to Grove Hill Road.

A Member commented that she felt that the consultation document was too complex. She added that she did not support the scheme as it would not address the problems in Lowlands Road and was unhappy at losing parking and green space. Members suggested that the scheme would increase congestion in the area.

(Councillor Mrs Kinnear requested to being recorded as having voted against he recommendation)

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That Officers be instructed to implement the scheme described in the report subject to the deletion of the entry treatment at Grove Hill Road and subject to consideration of objections to the traffic order and to take all necessary steps under sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended to relocate the motor cycle parking space and to replace seven "pay and display" spaces with 8.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday yellow line waiting restrictions as detailed at Appendix F. The statement of reasons to be "to improve road safety" and "to control parking".

[REASON: to improve safety and to improve pedestrian and cycle facilities.]

PART II – MINUTES

46. **Attendance by Reserve Members:** **RESOLVED:** To note the attendance of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:

Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Arnold
Councillor Kinsey

Councillor Mrs Bath
Councillor Bluston

47. **Declarations of Interest:** **RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of Interest at this meeting.
48. **Arrangement of Agenda:** **RESOLVED:** That all items on the agenda be considered with the press and public present.
49. **Minutes:** **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2002, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

Recommendation 3, 4/12/02 – Petts Hill Bridge

Minute 41 – Prohibition Hours in High Street Wealdstone – Part Pedestrianisation Scheme: Reference from the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel

Members raised and discussed matters relating to the progress of the above issues, arising from which detailed points were to be followed up by the Chair and Officers.

50. **Public Questions:** A representative of the Rowlands Avenue Residents' Association asked about progress on the closure of Rowlands Avenue. In response, the Chair informed the meeting that subject to Traffic Orders, the road closure would be introduced in June
51. **Petitions:** **RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions had been received

52. **Deputations**

- (1) **Re – Queensbury Station Area Parking review – Results of Consultation and Controlled Parking Zones/Residents Parking Schemes – Annual Review and Related Petitions:** From the Chairman of Queensbury Residents' and Traders' Association (see recommendation 1 and 3)

53. **References from Council and/or other Committees/Panels**

- (A) **Petition - Honeypot Lane, Harrow - Request for a CPZ** (Reference from Council: 23.1.03)
(This reference was dealt with under Recommendation 3)
- (B) **Petition - Cambridge Road/Pinner Road, North Harrow - Request for improved parking facilities** (Reference from Council: 23.1.03)
(This reference was dealt with under Recommendation 3)
- (C) **Petition - Request for car parking bays in North Harrow** (Reference from Council 23.1.03)
(This reference was dealt with under Recommendation 3)
- (D) **The inclusion of Spencer Road in the Wealdstone CPZ** (Reference of the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel meeting held on 11 February 2003)
(This reference was also dealt with under Recommendation 3)

RESOLVED: That the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel be consulted on traffic schemes which may have an impact on the economic viability of Wealdstone.

54. **Extensions to and Termination of the Meeting:** In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: At (1) 10.00 pm to continue until 10.30 pm

(2) 10.30 pm to continue until 11.00 pm

55. **Update on the London Congestion Charge: Issue placed on the Agenda further to the Request of a Member of the Panel:** A member referred the Panel to the document he had tabled regarding the Central London Congestion Charge. He reminded the Panel that the congestion charge would have an effect on Harrow residents and requested that Officers produce an assessment on the impact of the Congestion Charge. He was particularly concerned about the increase in congestion on public transport.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association's adviser informed the Panel that the impact of the Congestion Charge would be discussed the next Rail and Bus Liaison meeting on 4 April 2003.

RESOLVED: That Officers report on the impact of the Congestion Charge when monitoring information was released.

56. **Portfolio Holder Decisions: RESOLVED:** To note the report submitted

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 11.00 pm)

(Signed) JERRY MILES
Chair